

REMARKS

Claims 10-16 are pending in the application. Claim 10 is withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 11-16 are rejected.

Claims 11 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter not described in the specification in such a way as to allow one skilled in the art to understand the meaning of "coaxial and non coaxial parts".

With regard to a "coaxial" part, it is respectfully submitted this is supported by the specification and further one skilled in the art would understand this term to apply to a part having the arrangement of an inner conductor, an internal insulator and an outer conductor.

Support in the specification "coaxial" part

Applicant's specification and Figs. describe this coaxial part in several places, for example, on page 20, lines 13-35; Figs. 13, 12a, 12b, 12c. Also page 22, lines 21-29 and page 26, line 34 to page 27, line 3 describes the coaxial parts.

In particular the coaxial arrangement is clearly supported by Fig 13 which shows the inner conductor 102 and the internal insulator 104, 105 and the outer conductor 105a and 104a. The specification describes on page 21, lines 29-34 that the conductor 105a and 104a are electrically connected. This arrangement is not in contradiction to what one skilled in the art would understand for the meaning of a coaxial arrangement.

This is just one example of what is set forth in the specification with regard to the coaxial parts.

Further applicant's claim also set forth an arrangement not in contradiction with an understanding of coaxial, since claim 11 sets forth: a first conductor pattern forming an inner

conductor and a second conductor pattern forming an outer conductor, the flexible base being disposed between the first conductor pattern and the second conductor pattern so as to form an electrical insulation there between. Again this is clearly what one skill in the art would understand to be a coaxial arrangement.

With regard to a "non-coaxial" part

It is respectfully submitted that the intention of this claim term is to provide for a conductor which is not part of, or within a coaxial arrangement. Thus the claimed: "a non-coaxial part having a conductor pattern for transmitting a signal disposed atop the flexible base" is a conductor not part of a coaxial arrangement.

Support in the specification "non-coaxial" part

The specification does not use this term, therefore it has been amended in the claims. The specification does support this element, for example, Fig. 13 conductor patter 104b. The specification on page 21, line 13 "the signal transmission pattern 104b." As seen in Fig. 13 the signal transmission pattern 104b is not within the coaxial arrangement previously described. Other similar descriptions are provided in applicant's specification. Thus the signal transmission pattern 104b is not part of an arrangement of an "inner conductor," the "internal insulator" and the "outer conductor" of the coaxial part.

In view of the foregoing it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 11 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 11-14 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Schreiber et al. (Schreiber). The Office Action appears to be equating the dielectric 82, as

described in the reference, with the conductor pattern in the claims. The Office Action provides, for example, on page 3, line 9 "a third conductor patterns (82, column 2, line 29) ... (see Fig. 1)."

However, the element "82" Fig. 1 of Schreiber is a dielectric layer which serves as an insulator, as described in column 2, lines 25-31 and does not function as a conductor. Col. 2, lines 29-31 "the second dielectric lay 82 serves as an insulator between the signal return line 74 and the shield 104." The prior art describes a dielectric insulator.

Applicant claims "a third conductor pattern for transmitting a signal"

Therefore a dielectric as known to one skilled in the art and as described in the reference as an insulator would not anticipate a claimed conductor for transmitting a signal and as defined in applicant's specification.

As argued previously, Schreiber fails to teach or suggest the flexible cable comprising a coaxial part (structure) and part (structure) with a conductor pattern for transmitting a signal.

Schreiber does not teach or suggest a the conductor outside of the coaxial arrangement and provided separately from the coaxial part, within the same flexible cable.

In Schreiber the elements 105, 106, 87 and 46 shown in Fig. 1 are conductors, but form a shield. This shield is arranged coaxially to the coaxial part (60; 14; 75, 76, 17, 42, 26, 19, 44, 27), and is thus not a equivalent to applicant's claimed invention.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 11-16 are allowable over Schreiber and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Entering of Claim Amendments After Final

It is respectfully requested that the Amendments be entered and considered because:

- 1) The amendments were made to clarify the invention however it is still respectfully submitted that the claims previously stated the "non-coaxial part" was a transmitter of a signal.

The claims have not been changed in that respect. Clearly a transmitter of a signal as used would not have been anticipated by a dielectric as used and defined in the prior art, which is the same as one skilled in the art would recognize a dielectric as an insulator. Therefore there is no substantive changes to the claims.


2) Finality of the Office Action should be withdrawn because the claim rejections are unclear. The Office Action claims 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Schreiber et al. on pages 2-5, paragraphs 3-4, however there is no indication of the status of claims 15 and 16 other than they are rejected. The Office Action does mention the claims but the rejection is not clearly set forth. Accordingly the finality should be withdrawn.

3) It is also pointed out that the § 112 rejection names claims 11 and 14, however independent claims 12, 13 and 15 likewise use similar terms as claims 11 and 14. It is unclear whether these claims were likewise rejected or not. It was assumed that they were however the Office Action did not specify. Accordingly the finality should be withdrawn.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,


Brian S. Myers
Reg. No. 46,947

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304

Katten Muchin Zavis Rosenman
575 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10022-2585
(212) 940-8703
Docket No.: FUJI 17.514A (100794-00120)
BSM:fd